



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

dollars in 1900. With the increase in industrial enterprises has gone an increase of municipal debt, which in 1896-7 was one and a quarter billion dollars, an increase of nearly 200 per cent. since 1874-5. The municipal rates have increased during the period of expansion since 1892 from £2 to £2 6s. 6d. per capita in London, and from 17s. 3d. to £1 0s. 9d. outside London, whereas the total for England and Wales has increased from £1 0s. 7d. to £1 4s. 5d. The rate in the pound on rateable value has likewise increased in the kingdom and in London from 5 to 6 pence in the pound.

In addition to the tables of general statistics, the appendix contains detailed statements of the investments of the individual municipalities in productive enterprises. The present volume makes no attempt to weigh the evidence. It remains for a future report to pass judgment on the results of municipal enterprise. The expense, the risk, the wastefulness, the danger, both financial and social, are here set forth. The jury is to continue the hearing before it decides whether the benefits to property owners and to society justify the assumption by organized citizenship of the grave responsibilities of capitalistic enterprises.

WILLIAM H. ALLEN.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA.

---

#### THE CENSUS OF CUBA.<sup>1</sup>

THOUGH scarcely more than a year has elapsed since the enumerators started upon their rounds in Cuba, the final report on the census has made its appearance. Such promptness of publication calls for remark, not only because it finds few precedents in American census work, but also because the present undertaking was beset by peculiar difficulties, which, under a less energetic management, might easily have led to delay. A lively picture of the obstacles in the way of the field work is given in the reports of the six supervisors. The people—"victims," as one patriotic gentleman observes, "of the machinations and cupidity of the last administration"—were ignorant and suspicious of any governmental inquiry. To get to them was difficult, because the rounds had to be made in the rainy season and the war had left many districts without roads or bridges. After reading the

<sup>1</sup> Report on the Census of Cuba, 1899. J. P. Sanger, director; Henry Gannett, Walter F. Willcox, statistical experts. Washington, 1900.

adventures of the enumerator of Zapata Swamp, who found more crocodiles than people in his territory, one does not wonder that a seasoned veteran of the Army of Liberation "preferred twenty years of war" to a repetition of his census service.

The field work was done entirely by Cubans, though under the supervision of an experienced census official from the United States—Mr. V. H. Olmstead. The work of tabulation, however, was performed in Washington, whither the schedules were shipped in January. In order to expedite the process Hollerith electrical tabulating machines, first used in the American census of 1890, were employed. The task of preparing the analytic text to accompany the tables was entrusted by General Sanger to the hands of Mr. Henry Gannett, who has had much experience in similar work, and Professor Walter F. Willcox, at present serving as a chief statistician of the twelfth census. The same energy that characterized the enumeration has been displayed in all the later stages of the work in Washington, and as a result we have the final report some months earlier than the deliberate traditions of the American census led us to expect.

In general plan the inquiry was avowedly based upon the recent censuses of the United States; but the peculiar circumstances of Cuba naturally made necessary certain deviations from the model, most important among which was the restriction of the investigation to population, agriculture, and education. The report contains, however, considerable extraneous material, covering a wider range than the inquiries made by the enumerators. Thus the discussion of the tables is preceded by an account of the geography of Cuba and the history of its people, and followed by a critical review of the censuses taken under the Spanish régime, and a memorandum upon the very defective vital statistics.

Most complete and most interesting is the information regarding the population. In studying the tables one is made constantly aware of the frightful waste of human life in the struggle with Spain. The total population in October 1899 (1,572,797) was 58,890 less than the number reported by the last Spanish census, in 1887. If allowance be made for the natural rate of increase from that date the population at the commencement of the insurrection can hardly have been less than 1,800,000 souls. Thus it seems probable that the war and the reconcentration policy which accompanied it cost Cuba 200,000 people—a ninth of her population.

Different aspects of this loss are to be seen in the more detailed tables. For example, on dividing the sexes we find that the decrease in numbers has been much greater among males than among females. Indeed, if we compare the censuses of 1887 and 1889 we find that the number of women has increased 8,505, while that of the men has fallen 67,395. Similarly, the age tables show that the birth rate fell off seriously, and that infant mortality increased during the insurrection. There is no country for which statistics are accessible where there are relatively so few children under five years of age. Again, the analysis of the population according to conjugal condition shows that there is in Cuba a widower for every six husbands and a widow for every two wives. A further effect of the war is seen in the interruption of school work—of the children who should have begun school during the years of disturbance a tenth less can read than of their brothers and sisters five years older. Apparently the general destitution has made it necessary in many families to set the children to work prematurely, for the proportion of breadwinners among persons ten to fourteen years of age is nearly three times as high in Cuba as in the United States.

Another fact of far-reaching consequence in determining the social conditions of the island is the large number of persons of negro descent. Nearly one third of the people are colored, and at least since 1877 the negroes have maintained their relative numbers unimpaired in competition with the whites, and that with less help from immigration. Cuba thus seems to be confronted by a race problem similar to that of our southern states, though several of the latter have a much larger colored population to deal with—*e.g.*, South Carolina, where in 1890 barely two fifths of the people were white.

It is largely due to this negro element that the proportion of illiterates is so high. Of people over nine years of age 57 per cent. are unable to read. This is a worse showing than was made by any state of the Union in 1890, but no worse than the average for our colored population. But if the two races are separated in Cuba, it appears that slightly over one half of the whites could read, as against not much over a quarter of the blacks. Clearly the common-school system of Cuba has been sadly inadequate, but the negroes have shown less solicitude for learning than their former masters.

Another consequence of the large negro population is seen in the number of persons living together without the sanction of a legal

marriage. For every two lawful unions there is one resting merely upon mutual consent; but these irregular connections are more than three times as common among the colored as they are among the whites. Of cohabiting negro couples only 28 per cent. are legally husband and wife. It may also be that the negro population is responsible in Cuba, as in our southern states, for the small immigration. But slightly over one tenth of the population were born abroad, as compared with one seventh in the United States; of this tenth, three quarters were Spaniards, who can hardly be called aliens. The next most numerous class of immigrants are the Chinese.

In one respect, however—and this is perhaps the greatest surprise furnished by the census—the Cuban population differs much from that of the south Atlantic and south central states. In the latter the urban population is relatively small—about 7 per cent. on the average. In Cuba, on the contrary, nearly one third of the population (32.3 per cent.) live in cities of over 8000 inhabitants. This is a higher proportion than in the Union, as a whole (29.2 per cent.), or in any section of it, except the north Atlantic states. One is the less prepared for this result since the occupation statistics confirm the impression that agriculture is the predominant industry in Cuba even more than here. Of all American breadwinners 39.7 per cent. in 1890 were engaged in the extractive industries, while 48.1 per cent. of the Cubans were thus occupied. Unfortunately no attempt is made in the report to explain this anomaly. Perhaps one may conjecture that this is another consequence of the insurrection—people may have gone to the cities in large numbers because they afforded some protection from the vicissitudes of guerilla warfare, and sufficient time may not yet have elapsed to restore the usual distribution of the population between city and country.

On the whole, the explanatory text of the report seems to be an excellent piece of work, much superior in quality to the standard set in some of our census volumes. An unusual degree of ingenuity and discretion is displayed in analyzing and interpreting the data. Perhaps an example will best show the care and skill bestowed upon the work. The tables of conjugal condition show that very many more of the foreign-born whites are married than of the native whites. But the text warns us not to infer from this that marriage is more frequent among the foreigners than among the natives, for the former consist mainly of adults of marriageable age. Consequently, the

percentages are re-calculated for persons over fourteen years of age, and the difference almost disappears. But even this is not a satisfactory comparison, because there are many more men among the immigrants than among the natives. So the percentages are once more ascertained for the sexes separately, with the result that marriage is found to be much commoner among foreign than among native women, and but slightly more common among foreign than among native men. There remains, however, one more refinement. Comparatively few of the immigrants are under twenty-five years of age—a time of life at which the majority of people are still single. To get thoroughly comparable figures, therefore, it is necessary to contrast the natives and foreigners, not only of the same sex, but also of the same age. When this is done the final answer is reached. “At every age period the native white men were married in greater proportions than the immigrant white men, but the immigrant white women were married in greater proportions than the native white women” (p. 131).

An admirable feature of the report is the frequent employment of comparisons between the Cuban and other populations. Few readers, for example, would appreciate the significance of the statement that only 8.32 per cent. of the Cuban people were under five years of age, unless they were also told that the corresponding figures for the United States in 1890 were 12.19 per cent. Such illuminating comparisons have been common enough in the statistical work of some foreign countries—notably Germany—but the American census office has seldom condescended to admit them. It is to be hoped that their evident utility in the present work will persuade the gentlemen who prepare the text for the twelfth census to follow the example of the Cuban census, rather than that of their own predecessors in office.

When a book represents so distinct an advance in its peculiar province as does this report, it seems a bit ungracious to find any fault with it. But candor compels one to admit that the report has certain defects—perhaps only the defects of its merits. Certainly the promptness of publication upon which comment has been made was not secured without some sacrifice of finish, not to say accuracy. Even a casual examination reveals a few small errors not noted in the list of *errata*. For instance, if the population in 1899 and 1887 is given correctly on p. 72, the decrease in numbers must be 58,890, instead of 58,895. And if this be the true decrease, then how can there have been an increase of 14,924 among women and a falling off

of only 51,202 among men, as is stated on p. 82? Apparently this discrepancy is due, not to an error of the press, but to the fact that in one case the figures for 1887 were for the *de facto*, and in the other for the *de jure* population. The lay reader, however, is hardly likely to observe this distinction for himself, and, in any case, why is comparison made sometimes with one, and at other times with the other set of figures, when the data in question are accessible in both forms?<sup>\*</sup>

There are also several statements that would probably have been modified had the proof-sheets been revised with greater attention. When it is said, for example, of the colored population, that "Their diminution relative to the whites, during the last half century, is doubtless but another illustration of the inability of an inferior race to hold its own in competition with a superior one" (p. 97), the reader has only to glance at the table on the same page to see that this certainly is not true of the last twenty-three years. In 1877 the negroes formed 32.2 per cent. of the population, in 1887, 32.4 per cent., and in 1899, 32.1 per cent. This is not a rapid loss of ground, and one must recollect, as has already been suggested, that the white immigration (including here the Chinese) has been ten times as great as the colored.

Again, it seems very doubtful whether "for purposes of comparison with other countries . . . the persons living in consensual unions in Cuba should be classed with the single" (p. 145). On the contrary, the mere fact that the man and woman have dispensed with a marriage ceremony is less significant from the social point of view than the fact that they are living together and rearing families, like the couples whose union is sanctioned by law. Moreover, the report points out clearly (p. 117) that "in most cases" these same people, if living in the United States, would be held, in accordance with our less strict marriage laws, to be legally husband and wife.

Once more, the small difference between the ratio of breadwinners to population, in urban and rural communities, as compared with the difference in the United States, is ascribed in part to "the high proportion of females in Cuban cities" (p. 157). It would have been more accurate to say, "the low proportion of females in rural districts;" for the contrast between the two countries in the second case

<sup>\*</sup> It is implied in the report that the figures for the sexes are calculated upon the basis of the *de jure* population, but there is no intimation that the decrease in the total population is determined in another manner. To make the figures agree in the statement given above (p. 129), I have used in both cases the figures for the *de facto* population of 1887, as found in the appendix of the report (p. 713).

is stronger than in the first. Of our urban population 50.1 per cent. are women, while in Cuba the proportion is 51.0 per cent. But in our rural districts 48.5 per cent. of the inhabitants are females, while in Cuba the proportion is only 46.9 per cent.

Indeed, one is inclined to regret that the report was not held back another week, and the time spent in making a more adequate analysis of the whole body of occupation statistics. This is foredoomed, in any case to be an unsatisfactory branch of the exhibit, not less to the compiler than to the reader, and in the present instance the office was handicapped by the necessity of following the crude American classification. So far as the one topic seriously taken up in the text is concerned, the analysis is certainly more complete than the corresponding work in the census of 1890. But the writer stopped too soon. We are told nothing, for instance, about the specific occupations of the people beyond what we can learn from the clumsy tables in the appendix, where the callings are ranged in alphabetical order. There does not seem even to be any indication of what occupations were assigned to each of the five classes—if such a key exists it has been well concealed. Even the analysis of the data by classes of occupation is very incomplete. No attempt is made to investigate the differences between the occupations of the colored people, the native whites, and the immigrants—a topic that was found very fruitful in the eleventh census—and nothing is said of the character of the work performed in the cities as compared with the country. The detailed tables appear, on inspection, to afford a vast deal of interesting material, but not much of it has been utilized.

Finally, a word may be said about the style. It would be as unreasonable to look for literary finish in the text of a census report as to look for the *motive* of a novel in the tables. Clearness and correctness are the only demands that can justly be made. Now the style of the explanatory text is singularly clear and direct, though in the haste of publication a few grammatical solecisms were allowed to pass. It is perhaps finical to object to a careless phrase like “the fifty largest cities,” or even to the use of such a subject as “one fifth of the female population,” twice in the same sentence, the first time with a singular, and the second time with a plural verb (p. 158). But certainly it is justifiable to call attention to the slip-shod English of some of the appendices—particularly the translations of the supervisor’s reports

WESLEY C. MITCHELL.